

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/677,341	10/03/2003	Shin Fujita	116961	8764
25944	7590 10/05/2005		EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928			CHUNG, DAVID Y	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		2871	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Annlicantic				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary	10/677,341	FUJITA, SHIN				
Onice Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
The MAN NO DATE And	David Y. Chung	2871				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rr  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be eply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS for the course the application to become ABANDO	e timely filed  days will be considered timely.  rom the mailing date of this communication.  DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14	September 2005.					
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ Th	nis action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10 is/are withdrawn</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1-6,8,9 and 11 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) 7 is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and</li> </ul>	n from ∞nsideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami		ne Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	,	•				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:     1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a line.	nts have been received.  nts have been received in Applic  iority documents have been rece  eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	cation No eived in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summ					
<ol> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>14 September 2005</u>.</li> </ol>	Paper No(s)/Mai  5)  Notice of Inform  6)  Other:	il Date al Patent Application (PTO-152)				

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1 and 3 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al. (U.S. 6,812,984).

As to claims 1, 3 and 11, Watanabe et al. discloses a liquid crystal display in figure 1, having a plurality of scanning lines GL, a plurality of data lines that intersect the scanning lines SL, pixels P disposed in a matrix form to correspond to the intersection of the scanning and data lines, and a thin film transistor as a switching element. Figure 11 shows an identification pattern representing identification information that identifies each of the respective scan lines. This information is formed at the periphery of the display.

Watanabe et al. does not disclose a dummy pixel area. Shirahashi et al. discloses a dummy gate line, dummy data line and dummy pixel electrodes formed on the outermost portion of the display matrix. Shirahashi et al. teaches that by forming these dummy elements, the breaking of the outermost signal lines during etching can be

reduced. See column 14, lines 15-29. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to form a dummy pixel area to prevent the kind of defects such as signal line breakage.

As to claims 2 and 4, Shirahashi et al. discloses dummy circuit elements on both sides of the display to prevent line breakage on all sides. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide this in the device of Watanabe for the same reason. Watanabe does not disclose dividing the identification pattern to be on both sides. However, this was simply a matter of design choice. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to divide the identification pattern to be on both sides because it was a matter of design choice.

As to claim 5, figure 11 shows the identification pattern being connected to the pixel electrode via the scanning lines. Figure 11 also shows the identification pattern to be smaller than the pixel electrodes.

As to claim 6, figure 11 shows that the identification pattern is formed in the pad area such that it does not overlap with the data lines. It is inherent that the device disclosed by Watanabe contains driving circuits for driving the scanning and data lines since the device would not function otherwise. Figure 1 clearly shows the thin film transistors which function as switching elements.

Art Unit: 2871

As to claims 8 and 9, the identification pattern is formed of the same material as the scanning lines, in this case Cr, Al, or Mo. See column 3, lines 1-5. These metals both shield and reflect light.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 7 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: none of the prior art taught or suggested forming an identification pattern on the counter substrate.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Chung whose telephone number is (571) 272-2288. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

KËNNETH PARKER PRIMARY EXAMINER